REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of claims

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in this application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 21-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Campbell et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0208601, hereinafter "Campbell").

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner indicated that claims 6, 13, 20 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants further thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and noting that the priority documents have been received.

After carefully analyzing the above-rejection, Applicants offer the following comments:

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 21-26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Campbell et al.

However, to be an "anticipation" rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every element and limitation of the Applicants' claims. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically or inherently disclosed or described in the prior art. Campbell does not

teach each element of the claimed invention. With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegations. Based on review of the reference, there is nothing in Campbell et al. that discloses or teaches a method for "configuring a session for setting the plurality of service types having different traffic characteristics by the connection" as recited. Furthermore, nothing in Campbell discloses or teaches setting the plurality of service types before exchanging data streams with the PDSN.

Campbell discloses a method and system for controlling a plurality of communication sessions in a mobile network by establishing a first communication session at a mobile node, detecting a second communication session to be connected to the mobile node, sending a signaling message indicating a new communication session and a type of data associated with the second communication session to the client device, determining whether the second communication session is accepted and whether the first communication session is put on hold on the mobile node to enable communicating data associated with the second communication session (*see* paragraphs [0012] and [0035], Campbell).

In embodiments of the present invention, the method and system for receiving multiple services according to a plurality of service types in an access terminal comprises a configuration session for setting the plurality of service types having different traffic characteristics by the connection. The service instances describe various traffic characteristics and store service parameters corresponding to their service type. To allow a stream layer to identify a service type, the above service types are defined in a session procedure. The access terminal then exchanges data

streams with the PDSN in a service instance corresponding to a currently provided service among the plurality of service instances defined beforehand in the session configuration.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Campbell does not disclose or teach "configuring a session for setting the plurality of service types having different traffic characteristics by the connection". Campbell merely discloses reducing the waste of airlink bandwidth by intercepting a first communication session and switching the data flow of the second communication session to an existing air interface channel associated with the first communication session, or by terminating the data flow on an existing communication channel associated with the first communication session and employing the communication channel associated with the second session (*see* paragraph [0012], Campbell). In Campbell, the signaling message indicating a new incoming communication session includes information regarding the type of data associated with second communication session and is merely used for notifying a user about the data type associated with the second communication session (*see* paragraph [0036], Campbell).

This is different from embodiments of the present invention wherein a session is configured for setting a plurality of service types, each having different traffic characteristics, in order to allow a stream layer to later identify the service type of a stream among the plurality of service types defined beforehand in the session configuration. Therefore, Campbell does not disclose or teach "configuring a session for setting the plurality of service types having different traffic characteristics by the connection".

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing in Campbell that discloses or teaches defining the plurality of service types before "exchanging data streams with the PDSN in a service instance corresponding to a currently provided service among the plurality of service instances". Campbell merely discloses notifying a user about the data type associated with a second communication session via a signaling message after a first communication session has already been connected. This is different from exemplary embodiments of the present invention wherein a plurality of service types must be defined in a session configuration before exchanging data streams to allow a stream layer to identify the service type. Accordingly, Campbell does not disclose or teach defining the plurality of service types before exchanging data streams with the PDSN.

In view of the above arguments, Campbell fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 1. Since claims 2-8 depend from claim 1, and since Campbell does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, we submit that claims 2-8 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 9-13, 15-22, and 23-27 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Campbell. Applicants believe that these rejections should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons given above with regard to independent claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Independent claims 14 and 28 recite transmitting data between the AT and the PDSN in traffic paths established for a plurality of service instances set to a plurality of service types by a connection for the data service.

However, Campbell merely discloses reducing the waste of airlink bandwidth by intercepting a first communication session and switching the data flow of the second communication session to an existing air interface channel associated with the first communication session or by terminating the data flow on an existing communication channel associated with the first communication session and employing the communication channel associated with the second session (*see* paragraph [0012], Campbell). In Campbell, the signaling message indicating a new incoming communication session includes information regarding the type of data associated with second communication session and is merely used for notifying a user about the data type associated with the second communication session (*see* paragraph [0036], Campbell).

This is different from embodiments of the present invention wherein traffic paths are already established for a plurality of service instances set to a plurality of service types by a connection for the data service.

Therefore, Campbell does not disclose or teach "traffic paths established for a plurality of service instances set to a plurality of service types by a connection for the data service". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated allowable subject matter for claims 6, 13, 20, and 27 if rewritten in independent form. However, for the reasons noted above, Applicants believe the broader scope of the invention is patentable over the art of record.

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Stacey J. Longanecker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 33,952

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: March 16, 2007